SOME NOMENCLATORIAL TRANSFERS AMONG PERUVIAN ORCHIDS

 $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Y}$

CHARLES SCHWEINFURTH

Incident to working on the orchid flora of Peru, the following specific reductions were found advisable.

Elleanthus conifer Reichenbach filius in Walpers Ann. 6 (1862) 474.

Evelyna conifera Reichenbach filius & Warscewicz in Bonpl. 2 (1854) 113.

Elleanthus Weberbauerianus Kränzlin in Engler Bot. Jahrb. 54 (1916) Beibl. 117, p. 28.

Elleanthus conchochilus Schlechter in Fedde Repert. Beihefte 9 (1921) 46; in Beihefte 57 (1929) t. 103, Nr. 402.

A drawing from the type of *Evelyna conifera* from the Reichenbach Herbarium in Vienna has narrowly lanceolate leaves which are long-attenuate and up to about 22 cm. long and 2.5 cm. wide, a raceme about 6 cm. long and a lip which appears to be broadly rounded at the apex.

On the other hand, a photograph of the type of *Elleanthus Weberbauerianus* accompanied by floral analyses shows narrowly oblong-lanceolate acuminate leaves up to 14 cm. long and about 2 cm. wide, a raceme about 10 cm. long and a lip which is retuse at the apex.

However, a specimen (Soukup 473) apparently identical with E. Weberbauerianus has lanceolate-elongate-attenuate leaves up to 21 cm. long and 3.5 cm. wide, while the immature raceme is almost 7 cm. long. Another collection (Macbride 3489) has the leaf-blade of typical E. Weberbauerianus, up to only 15.8 cm. long, and a raceme about 8 cm. long. A further number (Weberbauer 7868) has leaves of both forms (elongate-lanceolate

and oblong- or elliptic-lanceolate) up to 19.5 cm. long and 4.3 cm. wide, and racemes up to about 9 cm. long.

Elleanthus conchochilus has somewhat smaller leaves (up to 11 cm. long and 2 cm. wide), a raceme up to 6 cm. long and floral segments (shown by analyses of the type as well as by the description) which are almost identical with those of E. Weberbauerianus.

Apparently the only noteworthy difference between the concepts is one of flower-color, *E. Weberbauerianus* being purple with white and brown lip and *E. conchochilus* said to be yellow.

It thus appears that these three concepts are specifically identical.

Elleanthus hymenophorus Reichenbach filius in Walpers Ann. 6 (1862) 480.

Evelyna hymenophora Reichenbach filius in Bot. Zeit. 10 (1852) 710.

Evelyna discolor Reichenbach filius & Warscewicz in Bonpl. 2 (1854) 113.

Elleanthus discolor Reichenbach filius in Walpers Ann. 6 (1862-3) 480-1.

In his original description of the Peruvian Evelyna discolor, Reichenbach cites as the more obvious differences from the related E. hymenophora the violet under side of the foliage, the erect inflorescence, the denticulate (not entire) keels on the lateral sepals, the broader more denticulate lip and the erect triangular acute (not retuse) rostellum.

A specimen of the type number of *Evelyna discolor* in our herbarium does not show any noticeable difference in coloration between the leaf surfaces, and the floral parts appear to match those of *E.hymenophora*, with the keels on the lateral sepals entire or nearly so. Moreover, an authentic specimen of the Central American *Ellean*-

thus hymenophorus from the Reichenbach Herbarium has a nearly erect raceme as in E. discolor, while a floral analysis on the same sheet shows a suborbicular dentate lip and the triangular tip to the rostellum described for E. discolor. Furthermore, a series of specimens of E. hymenophorus in our herbarium shows more or less erect racemes.

As now conceived, Elleanthus hymenophorus extends from Costa Rica, through Panama and Colombia to Peru.

Altensteinia fimbriata Humboldt, Bonpland & Kunth Nov. Gen. et Sp. 1 (1816) 333, t. 72.

Altensteinia sceptrum Reichenbach filius Xen. Orch. 1 (1854) 18, nomen subnudum.

Altensteinia boliviensis Rolfe in Mem. Torr. Bot. Club 4 (1895) 265.

The concept Altensteinia sceptrum was in part separated from A. fimbriata by its twice larger stature; but, in view of the great variation in size in A. fimbriata, this distinction seems inconsequential. A further characterization attributed to A. sceptrum is that the lip is orbicular. However, a specimen in our herbarium bearing the data of the type collection of A. sceptrum shows the round-ovate lip common to A. fimbriata.

Altensteinia boliviensis was described as "a less vigorous plant" than A. fimbriata, "with distinctly smaller flowers." However, we have seen a Peruvian collection of A. fimbriata (Macbride & Featherstone 1225) which is an even smaller plant than typical A. boliviensis but has considerably larger flowers than that concept with a suborbicular, not elliptical, lip.

Another Peruvian collection (Herrera 3503) has measurements which appear nearly identical with those of A. boliviensis, but the lip is suborbicular, not elliptical as described.

Thus there does not appear to be any justification for the above segregations from the variable A. fimbriata, a species which appears to show many gradations in the form of the lip from suborbicular to round-ovate or round-elliptic.

Altensteinia marginata Reichenbach filius Xen. Orch. 3 (1878) 20.

Prescottia pteristyloides Kränzlin in Engler Bot. Jahrb. 37 (1906) 393.

Altensteinia pterostyloides Schlechter in Fedde Repert. Beihefte 9 (1921) 126.

A careful comparison of these two concepts, as represented by records of the types as well as by the descriptions, indicate that they are conspecific.

The only discrepancies appear to be that A.marginata shows somewhat broader leaves than those of the type of Prescottia pteristyloides, and that the latter concept is noted as having narrowly lanceolate 1-nerved lateral sepals, whereas the lateral sepals of A.marginata are described as oblong and 3-nerved and are drawn as ellipticlanceolate and 3-nerved. Both species came from regions of the same altitude.

Altensteinia Matthewsii Reichenbach filius Xen. Orch. 3 (1878) 19.

Aa Matthewsii Schlechter in Fedde Repert. 11 (1912) 150.

Aa Lechleri Schlechter in Fedde Repert. Beihefte 9 (1921) 52; in Beihefte 57 (1929) t. 105, Nr. 411.

Judging from habit and analytical drawings of Altensteinia Matthewsii from the Reichenbach Herbarium in Vienna as well as from a specimen of that species identified by Reichenbach, it seems unwise to segregate from it the concept Aa Lechleri. Indeed the only discrepancy between the concepts appears to be that Aa Lechleri is described as having longer lateral sepals than Altensteinia Matthewsii.

Stenoptera acuta *Lindley* Gen. & Sp. Orch. Pl. (1840) 447—Cogniaux in Mart. Fl. Bras. 3, pt. 4 (1895) 252, t. 59, fig. 1.

Stenoptera elata Schlechter in Fedde Repert. Beihefte 9 (1921) 54; in Beihefte 57 (1929) t. 86, Nr. 335.

A comparison of *Stenoptera acuta*, as represented by a photograph of that species from the Lindley Herbarium at Kew, as well as by the detailed description and figure in Cogniaux's treatment of *S. acuta* (l.c.), shows that it cannot reasonably be separated from *S. elata* as represented by the description and figure (l.c.).

In fact the only discrepancies between the two concepts seem to be that *S. elata* is described as a rather taller plant with somewhat larger leaves and longer spike than *S. acuta*.

A Peruvian specimen referable to S. acuta (Weber-bauer 7583) is almost as tall as S. elata and has even longer leaves than that concept.

Peru: Ayacucho, Prov. Huanta, Choimacota Valley, at 3000 meters altitude, "evergreen bush-wood", flowers greenish, February 28-March 10, 1926, A. Weberbauer 7583; Road from Tambo above Osno to the Apurimac, at 2800-3000 meters altitude, June 1910, Weberbauer 5651.—Huánuco, Cuzco (ex Kränzlin) fide Schlechter. Also Brazil (type) and Bolivia.

Stenoptera pilifera (HBK.) C. Schweinfurth comb. nov.

Altensteinia pilifera Humboldt, Bonpland & Kunth Nov. Gen. et Sp. 1 (1816) 333, t. 73.

Stenoptera cardinalis Lindley Gen. & Sp. Orch. Pl. (1840) 448.

Porphyrostachys pilifera Reichenbach filius Xen. Orch. 1 (1854) 18.

Spiranthes orchioides sensu Kränzlin in Engler Bot. Jahrb. 26 (1899) 499, non A. Richard.

Since it appears wise to transfer this concept to the genus Stenoptera, the specific epithet *pilifera* must be used instead of the more lately applied adjective *cardinalis*.

The species appears to be widely distributed in Peru, as well as occurring in Ecuador.